

1 KEKER & VAN NEST LLP  
2 ROBERT A. VAN NEST - #84065  
rvannest@kvn.com  
3 CHRISTA M. ANDERSON - #184325  
canderson@kvn.com  
4 633 Battery Street  
San Francisco, CA 94111-1809  
5 Tel: 415.391.5400  
Fax: 415.397.7188

KING & SPALDING LLP  
DONALD F. ZIMMER, JR. - #112279  
fzimmer@kslaw.com  
CHERYL A. SABNIS - #224323  
csabnis@kslaw.com  
101 Second St., Suite 2300  
San Francisco, CA 94105  
Tel: 415.318.1200  
Fax: 415.318.1300

7 KING & SPALDING LLP  
8 SCOTT T. WEINGAERTNER (*Pro Hac Vice*)  
sweingaertner@kslaw.com  
9 ROBERT F. PERRY  
rpperry@kslaw.com  
10 BRUCE W. BABER (*Pro Hac Vice*)  
bbaber@kslaw.com  
11 1185 Avenue of the Americas  
New York, NY 10036  
12 Tel: 212.556.2100  
Fax: 212.556.2222

IAN C. BALLON - #141819  
ballon@gtlaw.com  
HEATHER MEEKER - #172148  
meekerh@gtlaw.com  
GREENBERG TRAURIG, LLP  
1900 University Avenue  
East Palo Alto, CA 94303  
Tel: 650.328.8500  
Fax: 650.328-8508

14 Attorneys for Defendant  
GOOGLE INC.

16 UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
17 NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA  
18 SAN FRANCISCO DIVISION

20 ORACLE AMERICA, INC.,

Case No. 3:10-cv-03561-WHA

21 v. Plaintiff,

23 GOOGLE INC.,

**DEFENDANT GOOGLE INC.'S NOTICE  
OF MOTION AND MOTION TO RETAIN  
CONFIDENTIALITY DESIGNATIONS**

24 Defendant.

Hearing Date: November 17, 2011  
Time of Hearing: 8 a.m.  
Judge: Hon. William Alsup

25 Date Comp. Filed: October 27, 2010  
26 Trial Date: October 31, 2011

# **NOTICE OF MOTION AND RELIEF REQUESTED**

2 PLEASE TAKE NOTICE that on November 17, 2011 at 8:00 a.m., or as soon thereafter  
3 as counsel may be heard, Defendant Google Inc. (“Google”) will, and hereby does, respectfully  
4 move to maintain the confidentiality designations of particular documents produced pursuant to  
5 this Court’s Orders [Dkt. Nos. 354 and 361], which bear the production numbers GOOGLE-12-  
6 100000001 - GOOGLE-12-100000011. Google brings this Motion pursuant to the Joint  
7 Stipulated Protective Order entered in this case [Dkt. Nos. 66 and 68], and it is based on the  
8 following memorandum of points and authorities in support, the Declaration of Mark Francis and  
9 accompanying exhibits, the entire record in this matter and on such evidence as may be presented  
10 at a hearing on this Motion.

## I. INTRODUCTION

12 On August 25 and August 26, 2011, Magistrate Judge Ryu ordered Google to produce  
13 certain documents in the litigation (“Lindholm Documents”). [Dkt. Nos. 354 and 361.] Google  
14 promptly did so, but Oracle challenged Google’s designation of those documents as “Highly  
15 Confidential - Attorneys’ Eyes Only” (“AEO”) under the Stipulated Protective Order in this case,  
16 [Dkt. No. 66 at ¶ 2.8], and requested that Google re-designate the document “Confidential,”  
17 rather than AEO. *See* Declaration of Mark Francis in Support of Defendant Google Inc.’s  
18 Motion to Retain Confidentiality Designations (“Francis Decl.”), Exh. A. Pursuant to the  
19 Court’s order, [Dkt. No. 462], the parties held a telephonic meet-and-confer pursuant to ¶ 6.2 of  
20 the Protective Order on September 28, 2011, and Oracle’s counsel confirmed that the meet and  
21 confer process did not resolve the parties’ dispute by e-mail dated October 3, 2011. Francis  
22 Decl. ¶3 & Exh. B.<sup>1</sup> Google brings this motion to defend the AEO designations on the  
23 documents in question, which bear the production numbers GOOGLE-12-100000001 -  
24 GOOGLE-12-100000011.

<sup>26</sup> <sup>27</sup> <sup>28</sup> <sup>1</sup> During the meet-and-confer, the possibility of sharing the Lindholm Documents with a limited number of Oracle in-house counsel and executives was discussed. Francis Decl. ¶3. Google, however, has a pending motion for review of Magistrate Judge Ryu’s ruling that the Lindholm Documents are not privileged, and for that reason stated that it could not agree to the proposed compromise. *Id.*

## II. DISCUSSION

A. **The Lindholm documents should be designated AEO at least until the privilege dispute is resolved.**

This is not the run-of-the-mill protective order designation disagreement. The primary reason these documents merit AEO designation is because there is a pending dispute over whether those documents are privileged, and therefore should not have been ordered produced in the first instance. [See Dkt. Nos. 441 and 472.] Any decisions relating to the confidentiality designation of the Lindholm Documents should therefore be reserved until at least the privilege issue has been resolved. *Cf. Laethem Equip. Co. v. Deere & Co.*, 2007 WL 2897851 (E.D. Mich. Sept. 28, 2007) (magistrate judge entered but stayed execution of order de-classifying documents because “it would be prudent to permit [the judge] to rule on plaintiffs’ objections [to an earlier magistrate order] before enter[ing] an order regarding declassification of documents. . . .”). This approach would be consistent with the Court’s previous granting of motions to seal regarding information related to the Lindholm Documents “[o]ut of an abundance of caution.” [Dkt. No. 477; *see also* Dkt. No. 460].

**B. The Lindholm documents were properly designated as AEO, even assuming they are not privileged.**

Moreover, even without the privilege issue these documents qualify for AEO status under the Stipulated Protective Order. That order permits AEO designation for documents containing “extremely sensitive ‘Confidential Information or Items,’ disclosure of which to another Party or Non-Party would create a substantial risk of serious harm that could not be avoided by less restrictive means.” [Dkt. No. 66 at ¶ 2.8.] As reflected in the declaration Google has previously submitted in connection with briefing on the privilege issue, Lindholm was tasked with “gather[ing] information for Google’s lawyers and management to consider in evaluating technology issues related to Oracle’s infringement claims.” [Dkt. No. 316 at ¶ 7.] A technology analysis related to a highly competitive business area meets the AEO standard. Moreover, Google does not publicly disclose its internal deliberations and evaluations of threats of litigation or the merits of such claims asserted against it, its potential responses to threats of litigation, or its strategic approach to litigation generally. [Dkt. No. 443 at ¶ 2.]

### III. CONCLUSION

For the foregoing reasons, Google’s motion should be granted, and the challenged documents should retain their AEO designations.

Dated: October 11, 2011

Respectfully submitted,  
KEKER & VAN NEST LLP

By: s/ Robert A. Van Nest  
ROBERT A. VAN NEST  
Attorneys for Defendant  
GOOGLE INC.